

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 21, 2007. Claims 29 and 33-37 are presented for examination, of which Claims 29 and 33 are independent form. Claim 29 and Claim 33 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 29, 33, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,978,557 (Kato) in view of U.S. Patent 6,901,057 (Idehara). Claims 34 and 36 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from those patents in view of U.S. Patent 5,513,839 (Green).

The present invention is directed to a distribution printing for a print job consisting of a plurality of pages, in which print data of color and monochromatic pages are output to color and monochromatic printers, respectively. Prior to the outputting of the print data to the printers, the image processing apparatus adds an ejection command to the print data such that an ejection position is changed in the printer(s) when a succeeding page is not serial to the previously outputted page.

Claim 29 has been amended to eliminate recitation of control means, and to recite that the adding means adds, to the print data output by the output means, an ejection command according to the color or monochromatic printer such that an ejection position is changed when a succeeding page is not serial to the previously outputted page, based on the ejection command added by the adding means. Independent method Claim 33 has been amended correspondingly.

Kato relates to an information processing apparatus that discriminates whether each page in a print job is a color page or a monochromatic page, and outputs any page containing color data to the color printer and other pages to the monochromatic printer.

Idehara relates to an apparatus that determines, for each of the color page group and the monochromatic page group, whether the succeeding pages of the group are continuous or not, and switching the bins based on the determination. The *Idehara* apparatus, however, makes the determination in an image forming apparatus, i.e., a printer. Applicant submits that nothing in *Idehara* suggests that an image processing apparatus makes such determination, or adds an ejection command to the print data prior to the outputting of the print data to the printer.

Thus, even if *Kato* and *Idehara* are combined (assuming without conceding that such combination would be a reasonable one in the eyes of a person of ordinary skill), the result of such combination would merely be an information processing apparatus that outputs print data of color pages to a color printer and print data of monochromatic pages to a monochromatic printer, after which each of the *printers* makes a determination as to whether the succeeding pages are continuous or not. *Idehara* executes the printing of color pages and the printing of monochromatic pages in the same printer. Since the determination is made in the printer, *Idehara* must provide the printer with a specific means for the determination. On the other hand, since the determination and the adding of the ejection command are made in the image processing apparatus according to Claims 29 and 33, printers used with the present invention as now claimed only require the

interpretation and execution of the ejection command. No specific means for such purpose are required to be provided in the printer.

Moreover, since *Idehara* thus is directed to an arrangement in which the determination must be made at the printer, it appears to Applicant that having such determination made in the image processing apparatus rather than in the printer would be to do exactly the *opposite* of what *Idehara* teaches, contrary to the analysis set out in the Office Action. It is submitted that accordingly, a combination of these two patents would not convey to a person of ordinary skill any suggestion to have such a determination made elsewhere than in the printer, contrary to what is claimed in Claims 29 and 33.

As discussed above, since the present invention is directed to a distributed printing by means of a plurality of printers including color and monochromatic printers, it is required for the image processing apparatus, not the printers, to add an ejection command to the print data. Applicant submits that no combination of *Kato* and *Idehara* can teach or suggest this feature.

For all these reasons, it is believed to be clear that Claims 29 and 33 are allowable over *Kato* and *Idehara*, taken separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional

aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P. Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS_WS 1713520v1